

ENTERED

April 13, 2023

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

BRANDON MARSH,

Plaintiff,

VS.

NUECES COUNTY JAIL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-CV-00263

**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION
TO DISMISS CASE FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**


On January 25, 2023, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued a “Memorandum and Recommendation to Dismiss Case for Failure to Prosecute” (M&R, D.E. 13). The Plaintiff was provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s M&R. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been timely filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s M&R is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s M&R. *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s M&R (D.E. 13), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the

Magistrate Judge. The Court further notes that Plaintiff has been noticed at all addresses provided to the Court for that purpose. All such notices have been returned to the Court as undeliverable. Therefore, Plaintiff has failed to keep the Court advised of his address for service, which constitutes an additional default. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to prosecute.

ORDERED on April 13, 2023.


NELVA GONZALES RAMOS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE